

## Remarks

Claims 1-27 are now pending in this application. Applicant has not amended the claims. Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of this case.

With respect to the priority, this application is a national phase application. In national phase applications, copies of the priority document are furnished by the receiving office in which the corresponding PCT application was filed, not by Applicant. Accordingly, there is no need for Applicant to submit a copy of the priority application.

Applicant has amended the specification to correct the typographical error in the reference character identifying the capacitor. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection to the disclosure.

The method according claim 1 includes preheating a solder tip in a solder pot with a preheated solder, coating the solder tip with solder in the solder pot, coating at least one of the end surfaces of the capacitor element with at least one pre-solder by bringing the coated solder tip into contact with the at least one end surface of the capacitor element, ceasing the contact between the solder tip and the at least one end surface of the capacitor element, and fixing at least one lead to the at least one pre-solder by soldering to the at least one end surface of the capacitor element. This allows an automated two step soldering of leads to a power capacitor. This has not been possible before and is a significant improvement in efficiency and quality compared to the methods known in the art.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent 3,259,816 to Katchman in view of U.S. patent 1,425,633 to Colby. The Examiner rejected claims 9-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katchman and Colby and further in view of U.S. patent 3,480,759 to Sachs et al. The Examiner rejects claims 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katchman and Colby and further in view of EP 1 112 803 to Tadauchi et al.

The combination of Katchman and Colby does not suggest the invention recited in claims 1-6 since, among other things, the combination does not suggest an automated method for manufacturing a power capacitor that includes fixing at least one lead to at least one pre-solder by soldering to at least one end surface of a capacitor element. Rather, Katchman suggests a capacitor roll comprising a pair of convolutely wound electrode foils of metal insulated from each other by separate sheets of suitable dielectric material. At col. 2, lines 10-13, Katchman suggests that terminals 5 and 6 are electrically connected to opposite foil edges by a metal connection 7 produced by a Schooping, soldering or other suitable process. Hence, Katchman does not suggest fixing at least one lead to at least one pre-solder, since there is no pre-solder to which to fix the at least one lead. Katchman does not include any suggestion of the use of pre-soldering or a two step soldering process recited in claim 1.

On the other hand, Colby suggests an electrically heated solder pot comprising an adjustable means for holding a soldering iron to be used for manual soldering. As shown in Fig. 1, Colby suggests manual soldering utilizing a soldering iron. Colby does not suggest an

automated soldering method that includes the elements recited in claim 1. Moreover, Colby does not include any suggestion of the use of pre-soldering or a two step soldering process as recited in claim 1.

In view of the above, the combination of Katchman and Colby does not suggest the invention recited in claims 1-6. Therefore, the combination of Katchman and Colby does not make the invention recited in claims 1-6 obvious. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

The combination of Katchman, Colby and Sachs et al. does not suggest the invention recited in claims 9-11 since, among other things, Sachs et al. does not overcome the above-described deficiencies of Katchman and Colby. For example, Sachs et al. also does not suggest an automated method for manufacturing a power capacitor that includes fixing at least one lead to at least one pre-solder by soldering to at least one end surface of a capacitor element. The Examiner cites Sachs et al. as suggesting a rotating solder tip. A rotating solder tip does not suggest fixing at least one lead to at least one pre-solder by soldering to at least one end surface of a capacitor element.

Therefore, the combination of Katchman, Colby and Sachs et al. does not suggest the invention recited in claims 9-11. Accordingly, the combination of Katchman, Colby and Sachs et al. does not make the invention recited in claims 9-11 obvious. Consequently, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

The combination of Katchman, Colby and Tadauchi et al. does not suggest the invention recited in claims 12-14 since, among other things, Tadauchi et al. does not overcome the above-described deficiencies of Katchman and Colby. For example, Tadauchi et al. also does not suggest an automated method for manufacturing a power capacitor that includes fixing at least one lead to at least one pre-solder by soldering to at least one end surface of a capacitor element. The Examiner cites Tadauchi et al. as suggesting solder having a melting point of 300-400°C. Solder having a melting point of 300-400°C does not suggest fixing at least one lead to at least one pre-solder by soldering to at least one end surface of a capacitor element.

Accordingly, the combination of Katchman, Colby and Tadauchi et al. does not suggest the invention recited in claims 12-14. As a result, the combination of Katchman, Colby and Tadauchi et al. does not make the invention recited in claims 9-11 obvious. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

In view of the above, the references relied upon in the office action do not suggest patentable features of the claimed invention. Therefore, the references relied upon in the office action do not make the claimed invention obvious. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections based upon the cited references.

In conclusion, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration of this case and early issuance of the Notice of Allowance.

If an interview would advance the prosecution of this application, Applicant respectfully

urges the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The undersigned authorizes the Commissioner to charge fee insufficiency and credit overpayment associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 22-0261.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 23, 2009

/Eric J. Franklin/  
Eric J. Franklin, Reg. No. 37,134  
Attorney for Applicant  
Venable LLP  
575 Seventh Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20004  
Telephone: 202-344-4936  
Facsimile: 202-344-8300